

## REMARKS

Receipt of the Office Action of July 31, 2009 is gratefully acknowledged.

In the noted Office Action, claims 10 and 12 - 18 have been re-examined and finally rejected under 35 USC 102(e) by Fornry et al.

Applicant is of the opinion that Forney et al can neither anticipate nor render obvious the present invention. And in order to better define the invention over Forney et a, claim 10 has been extensively amended. Claim 10 as amended included more defining steps neither found nor suggested by Forney et al. The two writing steps are not found in Forney et al, for example. In addition, the subject matter of claim 13 has been added to claim 10 as amended.

In view of the amendment to claim 10, claims 10 , 12 and 14 - 8 are believed to be in condition for allowance. This RESPONSE with the noted amendment to claim 10 are being filed with an RCE application, affording the examiner the opportunity to re-consider his rejection and allow claims 10, 12 and 14 - 18..

Date: October 31, 2009

Respectfully submitted,  
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC



Felix J. D'Ambrosio  
*Attorney for Applicant*  
Registration Number 25,721

**Customer Number \*23364\***  
**BACON & THOMAS, PLLC**  
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
Telephone: (703) 683-0500  
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

S:\Producer\jfd\CLIENTS\Endress+Hauser Holding GmbH\SEGE3004-EH0502\Nov 2 2009 Response.wpd